

QUORA:

Is climate change an imagined problem promoted by censorship and the media without scientific evidence?



James Matkin, LAWYER WRITER (2006-present)

Updated 3m ago

Yes, climate change by man is an imagined unproven problem. Sea levels are not rising, islands are not sinking, some glaciers expand as others melt, polar bears flourish, winters are colder with massive snowfall and the ski business is booming. Alarmist computer projections of catastrophic warming all fail. Where is the problem? Humans are a tropical species and most prosperous during warm interglacial period. We certainly do not need a colder climate.

QUORA: [Philip Kisluff](#), If you can keep your head when all about are losing theirs & blaming it on you.

[Written Apr 23, 2016](#)

Changing "global warming" to climate change means it can no longer be falsifiable.

As Karl Popper pointed out with other pseudo-sciences in vogue when he was alive

I found that those of my friends who were admirers of Marx, Freud, and Adler, were impressed by a number of points common to these theories, and especially by their apparent *explanatory power*. These theories appear to be able to explain practically everything that happened within the fields to which

they referred. The study of any of them seemed to have the effect of an intellectual conversion or revelation, open your eyes to a new truth hidden from those not yet initiated. Once your eyes were thus opened you saw confirmed instances everywhere: the world was full of *verifications* of the theory. Whatever happened always confirmed it. Thus its truth appeared manifest; and unbelievers were clearly people who did not want to see the manifest truth; who refuse to see it, either because it was against their class interest, or because of their repressions which were still "un-analyzed" and crying aloud for treatment. The most characteristic element in this situation seemed to me the incessant stream of confirmations, of observations which "verified" the theories in question; and this point was constantly emphasize by their adherents. A Marxist could not open a newspaper without finding on every page confirming evidence for his interpretation of history;

And

Astrology did not pass the test. Astrologers were greatly impressed, and misled, by what they believed to be confirming evidence — so much so that they were quite unimpressed by any unfavorable evidence. Moreover, by making their interpretations and prophecies sufficiently vague they were able to explain away anything that might have been a refutation of the theory had the theory and the prophecies been more precise. In order to escape falsification they destroyed the testability of their theory. It is a typical soothsayer's trick to predict things so vaguely that the predictions can hardly fail: that they become irrefutable.

Science as Falsification

And here are the the impossible to falsify predictions from 2007: Shortly after these predictions were made, the Northern hemisphere suffered a run of very cold winters; the North Atlantic experienced the lowest recorded levels of hurricane activity; and global surface temperatures refused to rise for best part of 20 years with most of the extra heat assumed to be going into the

oceans.

Now, don't get wrong, I'm not saying climate change is demonstrably false. I'll simply leave the last word to Popper: Some genuinely testable theories, when found to be false [predictions are not confirmed], are still upheld by their admirers — for example by introducing ad hoc some auxiliary assumption, or by reinterpreting the theory ad hoc in such a way that it escapes refutation. Such a procedure is always possible, but it rescues the theory from refutation only at the price of destroying, or at least lowering, its scientific status.

Take a few minutes to listen to Greenpeace co-founder, Dr. Patrick Moore explaining why “climate change” is only pseudo-science.



[Greenpeace Co-Founders Warns of Global Climate Change Scam / Global Warming Hoax !](#)

Moore shows that clouds are the wild card of the climate system and their formation is chaotic, non-linear restricting prediction to a few days. Clouds are one of many factors that cause our irregular and regional climate system.

Dr. Patrick Moore co-founder uses science and history to prove climate change is an imagined problem. He rebuts the “Global

Climate Change Scam” and warns -

Global Warming is on its way to be a two trillion dollar scam. Our politicians (NWO) goals are to have total power and control over all the people. These politicians are using powerful human motivators in climate change : Fear and Guilt. We fear our modern way of life will kill are children and grand children. We the people are being told, carbon dioxide is a toxic pollutant and must be curtailed. In fact without carbon dioxide above 150 parts per million, all plants would die. If these politicians succeed, food and energy will again be reserved for the rich and billions of humans will die of starvation or exposure.

Published on 22 Mar 2015

The Climate is always changing and is unpredictable

There is no stable period of temperatures in climate history. Therefore the warmists are the real climate-change “deniers” because they want the global temperatures to maintain absolute status relative to 1970. The following is basic information about the history of global warming confirms that the issue is not whether there is global warming or not. There is, but not from fossil fuels rather from **natural climate variation**. The only way CO2 from industry becomes relevant is if there is “catastrophic warming” beyond the trivial moderate rise in temperatures over the past 11,000 years (thankfully.)

Global Warming began 18,000 years ago.

Global warming started long before the "Industrial Revolution" and the invention of the internal combustion engine. [Emphasis added] Global warming began 18,000 years ago as the earth started warming its way out of the Pleistocene Ice Age-- a time when much of North America, Europe, and Asia lay buried beneath great sheets of glacial ice.


Earth's climate and the biosphere have been in constant flux, dominated by ice ages and glaciers for the past several million years. We are currently enjoying a temporary reprieve from the deep freeze.

Approximately every 100,000 years Earth's climate warms up

temporarily. These warm periods, called interglacial periods, appear to last approximately 15,000 to 20,000 years before regressing back to a cold ice age climate. At year 18,000 and counting our current interglacial vacation from the Ice Age is much nearer its end than its beginning.

Global warming during Earth's current interglacial warm period has greatly altered our environment and the distribution and diversity of all life. For example: warming dates back 18,000 years from the time the last ice age commenced melting without any human activity spurring it on. The warming continues at moderate rates today.

Last Glacial Maximum (18,000 ¹⁴C years ago)




The World 18,000 Years Ago

Before "global warming" started 18,000 years ago most of the earth was a frozen and arid wasteland. Over half of earth 's surface was covered by glaciers or extreme desert. Forests were rare.

Not a very fun place to live

Present Potential Vegetation



Our Present World

"Global warming" over the last 15,000 years has changed our world from an *ice box* to a *garden*. Today extreme deserts and glaciers have largely given way to grasslands, woodlands, and forests.

Wish it could last forever, but

[A Brief History of Ice Ages and Warming](http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossil...)

<http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossil...>

The World Is Warming But the Antarctic Is Getting Colder

by Jess Shankleman

July 20, 2016, 10:00 AM PDT

Trend toward warmer temperatures in the region paused in 1990s

Changes may be in step with natural variation, researchers say -

[The World Is Warming But the Antarctic Is Getting Colder](#)

The Little Ice Age is critical

Between the early 14th and late 19th centuries, a period of cooling known as the Little Ice Age chilled the planet. **Little Ice Age, Big Consequences - History in the Headlines - Little Ice Age, Big Consequences. January 31 ...** It killed an estimated 75 million people, including 30 to 60 percent of Europe's population. Jan 31, 2012 -



Skating on the Thames River in England 1600.

The cause of the Little Ice Age is not known for certain; however, climatologists contend that reduced solar output, changes in **atmospheric circulation**, and explosive **volcanism** may have played roles in bringing about and extending the phenomenon.

Variability in solar output

It has long been understood that low **sunspot** activity is associated with lower solar output and thus less energy available to warm Earth's surface. Two periods of unusually low sunspot activity are known to have occurred within the Little Ice Age period: the **Spörer Minimum** (1450–1540) and the **Maunder Minimum** (1645–1715). Both **solar minimums** coincided with the coldest years of the Little Ice Age in parts of Europe. Some scientists therefore argue that

reduced amounts of available **solar radiation** caused the Little Ice Age. However, the absence of sunspots has not explained the brief cooling episodes that occurred in other parts of the world during this time. As a result, many scientists argue that reduced solar output cannot be the sole cause of the interval.


Changes in large-scale atmospheric patterns

Many scientists maintain that the Little Ice Age in Europe resulted from a reversal of the **North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO)**, a large-scale atmospheric-circulation pattern over the North Atlantic and **adjacent** areas. The NAO is believed to have a large influence over winter weather in Europe. During its “positive” phase, characterized by a strong **subtropical high-pressure** cell over the Azores and a low-pressure cell over Iceland, the track of North Atlantic storms is roughly centred over the British Isles and northern Europe. During the NAO’s “negative” phase, characterized by a weak high-pressure cell over the Azores and a weak low-pressure cell over Iceland, moisture is funneled toward the Mediterranean, and cold **Arctic** air from Russia moves over northern Europe. Changes in the phases of the NAO may partly explain the variability in climate during the Little Ice Age as well as the known intervals of cooler-than-normal conditions in some European regions.

Increased volcanism

Cool conditions in different regions during the Little Ice Age may have been influenced by explosive volcanic eruptions, such as the eruptions of **Laki** in Iceland in 1783 and **Tambora** on Sumbawa Island in 1815. Explosive eruptions propel gases and ash into the **stratosphere**, where they reflect incoming solar radiation. Consequently, they have been linked to conditions of lower average temperature around the world that may last a few years. Some scientists hypothesize that such volcanic activity may strengthen and


extend the negative phase of the NAO, thus bringing on cooler conditions in northern Europe. Other scientists, however, argue that explosive eruptions may be linked to warmer winter conditions across northern Europe. Climate change happens in cycles over centuries and thousands of years not in a couple of decades. This means the U.N. obsession with global warming from human activity from 1990 is a badly flawed time period. . The paleoclimate record for our Holocene period shows the relevant time period must be at least 100 years or more. Encyclopedia Britannica



This insight is comforting. Based on longer time scales there is little reason to panic, particularly when the weather, climate variability and IPCC predictions are not cooperating with reality. Even more, paleoclimate assures us we are at the end of a warming cycle soon to turn very cold as we head into the next little ice age.


The whole scare about new global warming depended on the fudged data of Michael Mann ignoring the Medieval

Warm Period to show a catastrophic warming.
Corrupt data to support hot climate
From the beginning the UN climate alarm campaign was bedevilled with blatant data manipulation and corruption. In every case the misleading or missing data was intended to bolster a public belief that the planet is warming more than reality showed. The most infamous and effective deception was the hockey stick graph of Michael Mann showing a dramatic spike in global warming recently. Without the misleading hockey stick graph the Al Gore campaign of fear would not have happened.
”To understand the manipulation see the same time scale with the proper history represented also by the same IPCC below. *In its 1990 report, the IPCC showed the following graph of global temperatures over the last thousand years.*•



This was unexceptional. It showed the established science of the time. It was backed up by a huge amount of data and historical record. It showed the Mediaeval Warm Period, warmer than now, and the Little Ice Age, colder than now, and both entirely natural. But of course this did not suit the

purposes of the climate alarm establishment. In its 2001 report, this new graph appeared.



The graph made an immediate sensation. It featured six times in the IPCC's 2001 report. It was brandished around the world as proof positive of dangerous manmade global warming.

In Canada it was distributed to every school. It showed that the Mediaeval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age had not existed. It was exactly what every alarmist wanted to see. It was complete nonsense. It is called the "Hockey Stick" graph because the first flat part resembles the handle of an ice hockey stick, the sudden upturn the blade. The graph was based on two papers in Nature magazine (MBH98 and MBH99). It made the authors famous, especially the lead author, Michael Mann, and greatly advanced their careers in climate alarm. For a long time nobody questioned it or the data it was drawn from. Then a Canadian statistical expert, Steve McIntyre, asked to see the data. Eventually, reluctantly, it was ceded to him. He quickly showed that such data could not yield a Hockey Stick. The graph was pure quackery. The authors had used illegitimate statistical means, especially short-centring the data series for principal component analysis (a statistical method for

identifying trends in a mass

This probably represents the worst corruption of science in the history of climate alarm.

Many scientists have been warning politicians for some time that the storm clouds are gathering, and that the IPCC saga is likely to be the biggest scandal in the history of science...

Worse, some scientists at the Climatic Research Unit appear to have been working in league with US scientists who compiled the climate data for the Goddard Institute for Space Studies. The latter data appear to contain numerous biases which inflate the supposed natural warming of the 20th century. (In fact satellite data shows there has been no global warming since the late 1970s and cooling since 2001, see graph.) In the USA the Competitive Enterprise Institute has now filed three Notices of Intent to File Suit against the Goddard Institute over their 3-year refusal to provide documents requested under the US Freedom of Information Act.

Mathematician Christopher Monckton, former scientific advisor to Margaret Thatcher, describes those implicated by the leaked emails as a "Close-knit clique of climate scientists who invented and now drive the "global warming" fraud -- for fraud is what we now know it to be -- and tampered with temperature data". He adds "I have reported them to the UK's Information Commissioner, with a request that he investigate their offences and, if thought fit, prosecute".

Australia's Professor Ian Plimer agrees with Monckton's position, saying "Here we have the Australian government underpinning the biggest economic decision this country has ever made and it's all based on fraud."

<http://www.undeceivingourselves....>

Mann has tried to revise history arguing this Medieval warming time was not global. This fudge also has been easily refuted. See research published in Science 01 Nov.

2013 Vol. 342, Issue 6158, pp. 617-621 DOI:
10.1126/science.1240837

by Yair Rosenthal^{1,*}, Braddock K. Linsley², Delia W. Oppo³
Extreme weather comes from a colder climate

Cold snaps like the ones that hit the eastern United States in the past winters are not a consequence of climate change. Scientists at ETH Zurich and the California Institute of Technology have shown that global warming actually tends to reduce temperature variability.

*Scientists at ETH Zurich and at the California Institute of Technology, led by Tapio Schneider, professor of climate dynamics at ETH Zurich, have come to a different conclusion. They used climate simulations and theoretical arguments to show that in most places, the range of **temperature fluctuations** will decrease as the climate warms. So not only will cold snaps become rarer simply because the climate is warming. Additionally, their frequency will be reduced because fluctuations about the warming mean temperature also become smaller, the scientists wrote in the latest issue of the Journal of Climate.*

March 27, 2015

<http://phys.org/news/2015-03-cli...>

Winters are not moderate

The IPCC reports stated in the future winters will be moderate without snow. No. Winters are consistently breaking temperature records over the past decade. Winter weather is not climate change, but it is natural climate variability related to declining solar radiation.

<https://www.academia.edu/9561956...>

Beijing Report: Another unusually harsh winter in Mongolia that's decimating livestock and sending temperatures to minus 56 degrees Celsius (minus 70 Fahrenheit) may create a humanitarian crisis, with worse conditions still to come, aid groups warn.

A dzud typically happens once a decade but could strike for the second consecutive year. The dzud last year killed more than 1

million animals, afflicting the majority of Mongolians who depend on livestock for food, milk and income



<http://www.theintelligencer.com/...>

NATURAL CAUSES OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Leading scientists discredit the man made global warming theory with cogent reasoning. Here is a list with reasons of the top ten prominent climate scientists refuting the United Nations IPCC.



Many scientists refute AGW (manmade global warming) with solid facts, data and research. Some even show evidence of global cooling.

Scientist #1 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Dr. David Evans

[Dr. David Evans](#) used to work for the Australian Greenhouse Office (the main modeler of carbon in Australia's biosphere) from 1999 to 2005. He has 6 degrees, including a PhD from Stanford in electrical engineering. Evans believes that CO₂ has been causing global warming over the last century, but investigates the question: how much global warming does CO₂ cause? In 2012, Evans pointed out how the IPCC (the very political Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) models were flawed. These models are based on data sourced by NASA and Argo satellites, and assume that CO₂ is the only warming agent. They fail to take into consideration other warming agents. He shows how the models, both for air and water, have consistently over-estimated, predicting warming that never happened. Evans shows data from Envisat (European satellites) which reveal how the sea level is rising 0.33 mm per year (3.3 cm per century), far below what the IPCC predicts (26-59 cm per century) and fearmonger Al Gore predicted (20 feet per century!). Evans compares the models vs. reality, and concludes:

"The climate model's understanding of the atmosphere is

incompatible with the data ... the data is being suppressed ... this is not about science and truth, it's about power and politics.”
“The Copenhagen Treaty that was almost signed in 2009 would have created a worldwide bureaucracy that could override, tax, and fine national governments. This was a narrowly-averted silent coup, with clearly flawed climate “science” just an excuse ... (we still face) the threat of a bureaucratic coup using climate as an excuse.”

Money train: the manmade global warming or AGW movement is a gravy train.

Scientist #2 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Dr. Denis Rancourt

[Dr. Denis Rancourt](#) believes that the idea that global warming, on its own, could negatively impact the environment, is tenuous at best. He describes manmade global warming as a **psychological and social phenomenon** backed by no solid scientific evidence. The problem is that the AGW movement has become a **giant gravy train** (estimated to be worth anywhere between [\\$22 billion](#) to [\\$1.5 trillion per year](#)). It's hard for scientists and politicians alike to get off such a comfortable and profitable moving vehicle, since their prestige, reputations and salaries all depend on it.



Money train: the manmade global warming or AGW movement is a gravy train.

He reveals how real activists understand that the AGW is not true activism, but rather an **invention of the privileged world:**

“NGOs and environmental groups who agree to buy into the global warming thing benefit from it a lot, in the sense that the powerful interests ... fund them.

They have to pretend they are doing important research without ever criticizing powerful interests.

They look for comfortable lies ... they look for elusive, sanitized things like acid rain, global warming ... it helps to neutralize any kind of dissent ... if you're really concerned about saving the forest, habitat destruction and so on, then fight against habitat destruction; don't go off into this tenuous thing about CO2 concentration ...”

If only the hijacked environmental movement could see the obvious: carbon dioxide is a nutrient, not a poison.

Scientist #3 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Freeman Dyson

The 91-year-old mathematical physicist and scientist at Princeton University, [Freeman Dyson](#), started studying the effects of carbon dioxide on vegetation 37 years ago! His work has shown how the increase in CO₂ has been overall very beneficial for the Earth:

“There are huge non-climate effects of carbon dioxide which are highly favorable ... The whole Earth is growing greener as a result of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, so it’s increasing agricultural yields, forests and all kinds of growth in the biological world – and that’s more important and more certain than the effects on climate.

It’s enormously important for food production ... “



If only the hijacked environmental movement could see the obvious: carbon dioxide is a nutrient, not a poison.

Dr. Judith Curry fell into groupthink on the topic of manmade global warming.

Scientist #4 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Dr. Judith Curry

[Dr. Judith Curry](#) is Professor and former Chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology. She used to be on board with the AGW agenda, but

after the November 2009 **ClimateGate email scandal**, she changed her mind. She saw a lot of “*sausage-making and bullying*” was needed to build a consensus. She realized she had fallen into **groupthink**, based on second-order evidence: the (mere) assertion that a consensus existed. She was subsequently labeled a **climate heretic**. This is interesting, and suggests parallels between the religious fanaticism of the manmade global warming movement and the **Inquisition** – which persecuted and killed those who thought differently. Many have said that AGW is a religion. In her testimony Curry states: “*No one questions that surface temperatures have increased since 1880 ... however there is considerable uncertainty and disagreement about the most consequential issues: whether the warming has been dominated by human causes vs. natural variability, how much the planet will warm in the 21st century, and whether the warming is dangerous.*”

We have been misled in our quest to understand climate change by not paying sufficient attention to natural causes of climate variability, in particular to the sun and from the long term oscillations and ocean circulations. How, then, and why, have climate scientists come to a consensus about a very complex scientific problem, that the scientists themselves acknowledge has substantial and fundamental uncertainties? Climate scientists have become entangled in an acrimonious political debate ...”

Carbon dioxide – not the enemy! (CO₂ is the basis of the manmade global warming myth)

Scientist #5 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Professor & Nobel Laureate in Physics Ivar Giaever

Professor **Ivar Giaever**, the 1973 Nobel Prizewinner for Physics, talks about how manmade global warming has become the new religion which cannot be challenged. He likens CO₂ fearmongering to the story of the Emperor’s new clothes. The purported **97% consensus** and the **hockey stick graphs** are both utterly fake. He states that:

“Global Warming is pseudoscience ... from 1880 to 2013 the temperature has increased from ~288K to 288.8K (0.3%) ... the temperature has been amazingly stable.

Is it possible that all the paved roads and cut down forests are the cause of “global warming”, not the CO2?

CO2 is not pollution.”

Giaever also mentions the solution proposed by Steven Chu, former US Energy Secretary and 1997 Nobel Prize winner in Physics. Chu suggested painting all roof tops white – which would help reflect sunlight and lower warming, if in fact global warming is occurring.

Dr. Don Easterbrook shows copious evidence to refute manmade global warming, by demonstrating that global cooling is in effect.

Scientist #6 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Dr. Don Easterbrook

While the above 5 scientists believe there is some kind of global warming occurring (manmade or not), the following 5 scientists refute AGW by claiming the world is undergoing **global cooling**.

[Dr. Don Easterbrook](#) (in his presentation of 2013), Professor Emeritus of Geology at Western Washington University, exposes how the **data has been tampered with** (by NASA, NOAA and the National Science Foundation). He points out that:

- all high temperature records were set in 1930s before the rise of CO2;
- global cooling has been in effect since 1998, according to ground and satellite measurements;
- both the Arctic and Antarctic ice sheets are growing;
- CO2 is incapable of causing global warming (given that it constitutes 38/1000th of 1 percent of atmospheric gases);
- there is no correlation between CO2 and temperature;
- CO2 follows temperature rather than preceding or causing it;
- the sea level is rising (Seattle in specific) and falling (US Pacific Northwest in general) depending on where you are, and that the sea is rising at a very slow and constant rate;

- extreme weather (such as hurricanes) has not increased;
- snowfall has increased across the US; and
- that the oceans are still very alkaline (pH 8.2) not acidic.

Scientist #7 Refuting Manmade Global Warming:

Meteorologist & Physicist Piers Corbyn

Meteorologist and physicist [Piers Corbyn](#), brother of UK Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn, claims the world is cooling. He states outright that *“there is no such thing as **manmade climate change**“*. He also states that *“the truth is the IPCC of the UN is a political not a scientific body, and it even amends scientific documents before publication to conform to diplomatic niceties.”*

The scientists are politically appointed to the IPCC. Corbyn explains that “science” as we think of it gets so entrenched in its current thinking that it’s often difficult for new theories or more accurate explanations to break through the status quo. As esteemed scientist Max Planck once said:

“A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it.”

This Aussie cartoon depicts how the manmade global warming scam works all over the world. Credit: Steve Hunter.

Scientist #8 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Professor and Geologist Bob Carter

Former Professor and marine geologist [Bob Carter](#) points out that 280 ppm (parts per million) of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, or even 390 or 560 ppm, is suboptimal for plant growth. There could be way higher levels and it still wouldn’t be anything like “dangerous”! In this [presentation](#) on climate change, he exposes how kids are being trained to spy on their parent’s energy usage and become “climate cops”, and how the UN predicted 50 million “climate refugees” by 2010 (whoops!!). Interestingly, although he is Australian, Carter quotes the former [US President Eisenhower in his famous farewell speech](#) to show how Government money corrupts honest science and free,

critical thinking:

“Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades. In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity ... the prospect of domination of the nation’s scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present – and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.”

That is exactly what has happened now around the world – Government in general has become too big and is interfering too much in many things, including its paid-for “science”, so mainstream research has lost its independence and credibility. John Casey provides evidence of sun-driven global cooling, and shows that manmade global warming is nonsense.

Scientist #9 Refuting Manmade Global Warming: Engineer & Former White House Advisor John Casey

[John Casey](#) is a former White House national space policy advisor, NASA headquarters consultant, space shuttle engineer and author. He wrote the book *Cold Sun* which contains his research into global cooling. Casey investigated solar activity and concluded that we are now in a solar cycle or phase which could will lead to global cooling, not global warming, for the next

30 years to come. He claims this new cold climate will have a severe and dangerous affect on the world. In *Cold Sun* he provides evidence for the following:

- the end of global warming;
- the beginning of a “solar hibernation”;
- a historic reduction in the energy output of the Sun;
- a long-term drop in the Earth’s temperatures;
- the start of the next climate change to decades of dangerously cold weather; and much more.


Casey experienced firsthand in the White House how the US Government fired anyone not toeing the line with AGW propaganda – and has the power easily destroy the career and livelihood of any contractor (scientist) who dissented.

John Coleman’s public memo or “Cease and Desist” Notice on manmade global warming. It would be funny if the situation weren’t embezzlement on a grand scale ...

Scientist #10 Refuting Manmade Global Warming:

Meteorologist John Coleman

Meteorologist [John Coleman](#) has studied the facts about global warming and asserts that the data shows we are not undergoing global warming, manmade or not. He reveals how a great scientist named Roger Revelle happened to have Al Gore in his class at Harvard – and thus the Global Warming campaign was born. Revelle tried to calm things down years later, but Gore went on to become Vice President, make a documentary, win an Oscar and win the Nobel Peace Prize. Gore said Revelle was senile and refused to debate him. Coleman shows how tax dollars are perpetuating the manmade global warming alarmist campaign despite the hard evidence.



Al Gore, champion of the manmade global warming agenda at the (satirical) Church of Climatology! Credit: David Dees.

The campaign of climate fear led by Al Gore mistakenly links meteorological events like floods, drought, extreme winters with climate change.

*Oxford climate scientist Myles Allen chides , “**Al Gore is doing a disservice to science by overplaying the link between climate change and weather.**” To claim that we are causing meteorological events that would not have occurred without human influence is just plain wrong says [Myles Allen](#). *Al Gosaid last week* that scientists now have clear proof that climate change is directly responsible for the extreme and devastating floods, storms and droughts that displaced millions of people this year, *Not true.**

<https://www.theguardian.com/envi...>

Conclusion: The Science is FAR from Settled

This list of 10 is a tiny sample – and also noteworthy in that almost none of the above have been shown to be bought off by Big Oil, a charge often aimed at so-called *climate deniers*. All of the above scientists appear to be acting from a pure motive of telling the truth for truth’s sake. In actuality, there are thousands

of qualified scientists all over the world opposing AGW. A few more that didn't make the list were Piers Forster (Climate Change Professor, Leeds University) who said:

“Global surface temperatures have not risen in 15 years. They make the high estimates unlikely.”

and Dr. David Whitehouse (Global Warming Policy Foundation) who stated:

“This changes everything. Global warming should no longer be the main determinant of economic or energy policy.”

[10 Prominent Scientists Refuting AGW \(Manmade Global Warming\) with Solid Research](#)

Natural climate is chaotic and unpredictable

The causes of climate change often contradict each other i.e some make the climate colder while others warmer. There is no way to hold constant any of these factors in order to analysis another factor like Green House Gases. The “climate noise” of those other factors not being analyzed will always interfere with the analysis. This is certainly true of the alarmist theory demonizing carbon dioxide from fossil fuels as it runs head into natural climate variability from solar radiation etc.

Science literature well documents that the IPCC computer models and reports run too hot. The report that predicted in 2001 that winters would be moderate without snow under their theory of catastrophic global warming could not be farther from the truth. Here is peer reviewed research from leading climate scientists explaining why all of the projections of the alarmists run too hot ›

Why models run hot: results from an irreducibly simple climate model

- 1st [Christopher Monckton](#)
- 2nd [Willie W.-H. Soon](#)
- 3rd [David R. Legates](#)
- 4th [William M. Briggs](#)

Abstract

An irreducibly simple climate-sensitivity model is designed to

empower even non-specialists to research the question how much global warming we may cause. In 1990, the First Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) expressed “substantial confidence” that near-term global warming would occur twice as fast as subsequent observation. Given rising CO₂ concentration, few models predicted no warming since 2001. Between the pre-final and published drafts of the Fifth Assessment Report, IPCC cut its near-term warming projection substantially, substituting “expert assessment” for models’ near-term predictions. Yet its long-range predictions remain unaltered. The model indicates that IPCC’s reduction of the feedback sum from 1.9 to 1.5 W m⁻² K⁻¹ mandates a reduction from 3.2 to 2.2 K in its central climate-sensitivity estimate; that, since feedbacks are likely to be net-negative, a better estimate is 1.0 K; that there is no unrealized global warming in the pipeline; that global warming this century will be IPCC in its Fourth and Fifth Assessment Reports that are highlighted in the present paper is vital. Once those discrepancies are taken into account, the impact of anthropogenic global warming over the next century, and even as far as equilibrium many millennia hence, may be no more than one-third to one-half of IPCC’s current projections.

· January 2015

DOI: 10.1007/s11434-014-0699-2

Climate Alarmists Have Been Wrong About Virtually Everything

Written by Alex Newman

<http://www.thenewamerican.com/te...>

Dr. John Christy, professor of atmospheric science and director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama Huntsville (UAH), analyzed all 73 UN computer models. “I compared the models with observations in the key area — the tropics — where the climate models showed a real impact of greenhouse gases,” Christy told CNSNews. “I wanted to compare the real world temperatures with the models in a place

where the impact would be very clear.”

Using datasets of temperatures from NASA, the U.K. Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research at the University of East Anglia, NOAA, satellites measuring atmospheric and deep oceanic temperatures, and a remote sensor system in California, he found, “All show a lack of warming over the past 17 years.” In other words, global warming has been on “pause” for almost two decades — a fact that has been acknowledged even by many of the most zealous UN climate alarmists. “All 73 models’ predictions were on average three to four times what occurred in the real world.”

No explanation for what happened to the warming — such as “the oceans ate my global warming” — has withstood scrutiny. Almost laughably, in its latest report, the UN IPCC increased its alleged “confidence” in its theory, an action experts such as Christy could not rationalize. “I am baffled that the confidence increases when the performance of your models is conclusively failing,” he said. “I cannot understand that methodology.... It’s a very embarrassing result for the climate models used in the IPCC report.” “When 73 out of 73 [climate models] miss the point and predict temperatures that are significantly above the real world, they cannot be used as scientific tools, and definitely not for public policy decision-making,” he added.

Other warming predictions have also fallen flat. For instance, for almost two decades now, climate alarmists have been claiming that snow would soon become a thing of the past.

The end of snow: The IPCC has also hyped snowless winters. In its 2001 report, it claimed “milder winter temperatures will decrease heavy snowstorms.” Again, though, the climate refused to cooperate. The latest data from Rutgers’ Global Snow Lab showed an all-time new record high in autumn snow cover across the northern hemisphere in 2014, when more than 22 million square kilometers were covered.

The Extent of Natural Climate Variability

Here is the caution from the most comprehensive and critical

analysis of climate by the National Research Council entitled, **“GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE Research Pathways for the Next Decade**

Findings of the paleoclimate community have shown the large degree of natural climate variability present in the climate record on many timescales. The impressive and often abrupt swings in climate recorded over the past several thousand years, such as the Little Ice Age, may if anything understate the potential for natural climate variability. ...With or without anthropogenic greenhouse warming, we must recognize the potential for the Earth's climate system to change, over a human lifetime, in ways that may have direct and important consequences on society and people's quality of life...

*Climate change is produced by single forcings (e.g., volcanism) and multiple forcings that can act nonlinearly to produce **climate “surprises.”** [emphasis added]*

<https://www.nap.edu/read/5992/ch...>

Pacific Ocean Heat Content During the Past 10,000 Years

Deep Heating

Global warming is popularly viewed only as an atmospheric process, when, as shown by marine temperature records covering the last several decades, most heat uptake occurs in the ocean. How did subsurface ocean temperatures vary during past warm and cold intervals? Rosenthal et al. (p. 617) present a temperature record of western equatorial Pacific subsurface and intermediate water masses over the past 10,000 years that shows that heat content varied in step with both northern and southern high-latitude oceans. The findings support the view that the Holocene Thermal Maximum, the Medieval Warm Period, and the Little Ice Age were global events, and they provide a long-term perspective for evaluating the role of ocean heat content in various warming scenarios for the future.

Abstract

Observed increases in ocean heat content (OHC) and temperature are robust indicators of global warming during the

past several decades. We used high-resolution proxy records from sediment cores to extend these observations in the Pacific 10,000 years beyond the instrumental record. We show that water masses linked to North Pacific and Antarctic intermediate waters were warmer by $2.1 \pm 0.4^{\circ}\text{C}$ and $1.5 \pm 0.4^{\circ}\text{C}$, respectively, during the middle Holocene Thermal Maximum than over the past century. Both water masses were $\sim 0.9^{\circ}\text{C}$ warmer during the Medieval Warm period than during the Little Ice Age and $\sim 0.65^{\circ}$ warmer than in recent decades. Although documented changes in global surface temperatures during the Holocene and Common era are relatively small, the concomitant changes in OHC are large. We should celebrate the carbon cycle.

Conclusion we should celebrate increased CO₂

Carbon dioxide is the staff of our life and essential to plant life through photosynthesis. Human emissions of non-polluting carbon dioxide are tremendously beneficial and should be celebrate . Dr. Patrick Moore gives a cogent analysis why increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is saving us from the inevitable next ice age.

[The TRUTH about carbon dioxide \(CO₂\): Patrick Moore, Sensible Environmentalist](#)

Science or Science Fiction? Professionals' Discursive Construction of Climate Change

[Science or Science Fiction? Professionals' Discursive Construction of Climate Change](#)

[Lianne M. Lefsrud, Renate E. Meyer](#)

First Published November 19, 2012 research-article

Abstract

This paper examines the framings and identity work associated with professionals' discursive construction of climate change science, their legitimation of themselves as experts on 'the truth', and their attitudes towards regulatory measures. Drawing from survey responses of 1077 professional engineers and geoscientists, we reconstruct their framings of the issue and knowledge claims to position themselves within their

organizational and their professional institutions...

Introduction

With all of the hysteria, all of the fear, all of the phony science, could it be that man-made global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people? (Inhofe, 2003)

•

Frame 2: Nature is overwhelming

The second largest group (24%) express a 'nature is overwhelming' frame. In their diagnostic framing, they believe that changes to the climate are natural, normal cycles of the Earth. Their focus is on the past: 'If you think about it, global warming is what brought us out of the Ice Age.' Humans are too insignificant to have an impact on nature: 'It is a mistake to think that human activity can change this... It would be like an ant in a bowling ball who thinks it can have a significant influence the roll of the ball.' More than others, they strongly disagree that climate change poses any significant public risk and see no impact on their personal lives. In their prognostic framing, they do not see any risks. If anything, climate change detracts from more important issues: 'Why don't we focus on more urgent issues... 25,000 people die each day due to hunger, malaria ...' They are most likely to speak against climate science as being science fiction, 'manipulated and fraudulent'. They are least likely to believe that the scientific debate is settled, that IPCC modeling is accurate, and oppose all regulation 'based on the incorrect assumption that greenhouse gases cause climate change'. They recognize that we should reduce pollution regardless: 'We need to adapt to climate change, which has been going on for 4 billion years. We need to reduce polluting our planet.' In their identity and boundary work, they are least likely to list others as allies or prescribe any actions for themselves or others. Significantly, they are more likely to criticize others as unknowledgeable and to describe climate scientists and environmentalists as hysterical: 'This present hysteria on "global warming" is purely political and has little to do with real science.' APEGA 'should educate the

public and the government ... to counteract media hype and pressure from the green extremists.'

Arctic Polar Bear Numbers Stable

Posted 28 February 2017 by [NetNewsLedger](#) in [Anishinaabe NetNewsLedger - Thunder Bay News - Arctic Polar Bear Numbers Stable](#)

Arctic Polar Bear

Polar bear and yearlings on an ice floe, Nunavut, Canada. © Lee Narraway / Students on Ice (WWF-Canada)

Climate Change Still Major Threat to Long Term Stability

IQALUIT – [Newly released survey results](#) show two of Canada's 13 polar bear subpopulations, previously thought to be declining, are likely stable and one could even be increasing.

David Miller, president and CEO of WWF-Canada, says "Though it is encouraging to see these polar bear populations are stable, climate change will continue to have a significant impact on the quality and availability of their habitat. Sea ice is vital for polar bears. This survey, coupled with anticipated continuing sea-ice declines, underscores the importance of protecting the Last Ice Area – where summer sea ice is expected to last the longest – for the long-term health of this species."

Brandon Laforest, senior specialist, Arctic species and ecosystems for WWF-Canada, comments "This work has helped to establish a reliable estimate for these polar bear subpopulations, a key component for the creation of a comprehensive conservation plan and a baseline from which to measure their health in the future. The decreases in reproduction and body condition of polar bears in Baffin Bay are very concerning. As sea ice continues to decline, frequent and timely monitoring of polar bear subpopulations across Canada will be necessary to ensure co-management boards can make informed decisions."

But the decline of Arctic sea ice is still a major threat to the species' long-term survival, the survey report says.

What the report finds

-

The Baffin Bay and Kane Basin subpopulations are now estimated to be 2,826 and 357 bears, respectively. These numbers are higher than the last time the bears were surveyed in the 1990s.

-

The Baffin Bay subpopulation has experienced dramatic losses in sea-ice habitat. Every decade since 1979 has seen an ice-free period that lasts on average 12 days longer, and sea ice melt is occurring three to four weeks earlier in the 2000s than it did in the 1990s. For Baffin Bay polar bears, this habitat loss has resulted in a shift in range northward in all seasons, and bears spending 20 to 30 days more on land now compared to the 1990s.

-

Though the subpopulations are currently stable, the report outlines many areas of concern for the Baffin Bay subpopulation related to declining sea ice due to climate change. This has resulted in:

Decreases in body condition.

Declines in cub production.

An increase in the frequency of long swimming events for female polar bears.

-

These subpopulations are shared between Canada (Nunavut) and Greenland.

[Scientists Surprised: Global Sea Ice Unexpectedly Stable Over Past 35 Years, Arctic Stable Last 10 Years!](#)

By P Gosselin on 14. November 2015

It's a good time to take a look at how global sea ice is doing at both poles. We were told over and over that the poles are the canary in the coal mine for global warming.

If the sea ice melt trend accelerated, we were warned, then the planet was warming rapidly and societies would be wise to prepare quickly for long-term sea level rise.

But nothing has happened at the poles so far.

Like everything related to climate and weather, there's a lot of volatility built into the infinitely complex system, and so short term changes should not be viewed hysterically.

It is important to keep the focus on the long term and to keep a rational head. When that is done, then we quickly see that there is nothing to worry about and that all the climate indicators are all well within the normal range of natural variability.

The following chart shows Arctic sea ice coverage anomaly from the mean since satellite measurements began in 1978:

The above chart, from arctic.atmos.uiuc.edu/cryosphere, shows that the Arctic sea ice was in fact quite stable from 1979 to 2002, trending downward only slightly. Then from 2002 to 2007, a period of only 5 years, the sea ice saw almost all of its melting. Over the past 10 years, however, the Arctic sea ice has been stable, even growing some over the past 6 years.

Indeed a number of scientists are projecting the Arctic sea ice to recover as the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO) enters its negative mode of its typical 50-60 year cycle.

It needs to be pointed out that 35 years is a short period when attempting to derive long term sea ice trends. Let us recall it is known that the Arctic sea ice coverage moves in multidecadal cycles, impacted heavily by natural oceanic cycles.

In the 1950s photos of an ice-free north pole are famous. Old newspaper clippings from the early 20th century quoted scientists who reported "dramatic melting" in the Arctic.

Easy Plugin for AdSense V8.67 [midtext: 0 urCount: 0 urMax: 0]

Easy Plugin for AdSense V8.67

Antarctic accelerating sea ice growth trend

The South Pole has been a real embarrassment for the global warming alarmists who earlier predicted a meltdown. That too has not happened. Instead the Antarctic trend has gone in **the totally opposite direction**:

Source: arctic.atmos.uiuc.edu/cryosphere

The above chart shows that Antarctic sea ice cover has in fact

been accelerating upwards. Over the past several months the sea ice has fallen from its record high levels and is now dead normal – for the first time in more than 3 years!

-

See more at: <http://notrickszone.com/2015/11/14/scientists-surprised-global-sea-ice-unexpectedly-stable-over-past-35-years-arctic-stable-last-10-years/#sthash.0jQahlui.dpuf>

117 Views · View Upvotes

Upvotes1

Comments4

Share

View 5 Other Answers to this Question

About the Author



James Matkin

LAWYER WRITER

2006-present

LL.M. Labor, Harvard Law School

Graduated 1969

Lives in Vancouver, BC
1970-present

2.6k answer views
1.8k this month